

1 ROBERT ATKINS (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
ratkins@paulweiss.com
2 CAITLIN E. GRUSAUSKAS (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
cgrusauskas@paulweiss.com
3 ANDREA M. KELLER (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
akeller@paulweiss.com
4 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**
& GARRISON LLP
5 1285 Avenue of the Americas
6 New York, NY 10019
7 Telephone: (212) 373-3183
Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

8 RANDALL S. LUSKEY (SBN: 240915)
rluskey@paulweiss.com
9 MARC PRICE WOLF (SBN: 254495)
mpricewolf@paulweiss.com
10 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**
& GARRISON LLP
11 535 Mission Street, 24th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
13 Telephone: (628) 432-5100
Facsimile: (628) 232-3101

14
15 *Attorneys for Defendants*
16 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; RASIER, LLC;
and RASIER-CA, LLC

17 [Additional Counsel Listed on Following Page]

18
19 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
20
21 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
22
23 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

24
25 IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
26 PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
27 LITIGATION

28 Case No. 3:23-md-3084-CRB

DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES,
INC., RASIER, LLC, AND RASIER-CA,
LLC'S MOTION TO MODIFY PRETRIAL
ORDER NO. 5

This Document Relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

Judge: Honorable Lisa J. Cisneros
Date: February 22, 2024
Time: 3:00 PM via Zoom
Courtroom: G – 15th Floor

1 KYLE SMITH (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
2 ksmith@paulweiss.com
3 JESSICA PHILLIPS (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
4 jphillips@paulweiss.com
5 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**
6 **& GARRISON LLP**
7 2001 K Street, NW
8 Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 223-7300

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Attorneys for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; RASIER, LLC;
and RASIER-CA, LLC

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, LLC (collectively,
 4 “Uber”) submit this brief in support of their Motion to Modify Pretrial Order No. 5 (the “Motion”).
 5 In compliance with Pretrial Order (“PTO”) No. 5, Uber is gathering the documents it produced in
 6 prior sexual assault cases and arbitrations concerning Uber’s general (*i.e.*, not case-specific)
 7 policies, procedures, practices, and safety measures related to sexual assault. However, Uber
 8 respectfully requests that PTO No. 5 be modified to the extent that Uber shall not be required to
 9 produce documents it produced in other sexual assault cases that relate specifically to the plaintiffs
 10 in those cases.¹ It is neither relevant nor appropriate to require the production of documents about
 11 these specific plaintiffs, who are alleged victims of sexual assault or misconduct and many of
 12 whom decided to resolve their claims privately and confidentially without a public trial or other
 13 adjudication. The Court should thus modify PTO No. 5 for four reasons:

14 *First*, these highly-sensitive plaintiff-specific documents about other, unrelated incidents
 15 of sexual assault or misconduct have no relevance to the unique and highly-individualized
 16 incidents and experiences alleged by the MDL Plaintiffs. No two incidents of alleged sexual
 17 misconduct are alike and no two victims of sexual misconduct experience the same impact. The
 18 nature of the alleged misconduct ranges from inappropriate comments to sexual assault, and all
 19 variations in between, and the circumstances of the alleged incidents vary dramatically from case
 20 to case. The principal tortfeasors (the independent drivers), the conduct of the independent drivers,
 21 and the consequences for the plaintiffs are different in every case. What might have happened to
 22 one individual says nothing about what might have happened to another individual, and thus has
 23 absolutely no relevance here. For that reason alone, PTO No. 5 should be modified.

24 *Second* - - and perhaps most importantly - - production of plaintiff-specific documents
 25 poses very serious privacy and confidentiality concerns for the alleged victims of sexual assault or
 26 misconduct, many of whom chose to resolve their cases on a private and confidential basis and

27 1 In the context of this brief, lower case “plaintiffs” refers to plaintiffs in the prior litigations at
 28 issue, not the Plaintiffs in this MDL.

1 thereby put their legal claims behind them. ***Documents involving survivors of sexual assault do***
 2 ***not constitute “off the shelf discovery” as contemplated in other mass tort contexts.*** Production
 3 of case-specific documents without the plaintiffs’ knowledge or consent unnecessarily deprives
 4 survivors of control and agency over their own experiences, when it should be up to them to decide
 5 whether, when, where, and how to share the details of these uniquely traumatic events. These
 6 concerns are part of the reason that nearly all of the plaintiff-specific documents are governed by
 7 protective orders and confidentiality agreements. Absent those protections, the individual
 8 plaintiffs might never have pursued their legal claims, and the documents about their incidents
 9 might never have been produced in litigation.

10 *Third*, to the extent that the MDL Plaintiffs seek plaintiff-specific discovery to show that
 11 Uber was on notice of reports of sexual assault or misconduct by other independent drivers using
 12 the Uber platform, that is duplicative of information MDL Plaintiffs already possess, and is
 13 unnecessary. The documents that Uber will produce in discovery, the written discovery and
 14 depositions available to the MDL Plaintiffs, and publicly-filed complaints will more than suffice.
 15 The MDL Plaintiffs do not need, on top of all that, documents about specific individuals and
 16 incidents that are unrelated to the incidents at hand and capture private experiences of survivors
 17 who have not asked to be involved in this litigation.

18 *Finally*, Uber could be seriously prejudiced by production of case-specific documents from
 19 prior cases, as the underlying allegations in those cases were never legally or factually tested or
 20 adjudicated and may not even involve issues presented in the MDL cases. If the MDL Plaintiffs
 21 intend to use case-specific documents in their own cases, Uber will not be able to defend itself and
 22 its actions as they relate to the previously-resolved cases without effectively reopening and taking
 23 discovery in those cases. In this way, production of those documents risks this MDL devolving
 24 into mini-litigations over the facts of cases not at issue in the MDL that have long been resolved.²

25 ² Moreover, some prior litigations related to sexual assault are even further disconnected from the
 26 cases in this MDL. For example, some of the prior litigations involve alleged assaults committed
 27 by someone other than an independent driver or someone fraudulently posing as an independent
 28 driver. Other cases involve alleged incidents that occurred long (*i.e.*, months) after the alleged
 Uber-connected ride took place. Discovery in these types of cases involve documents that have
 no relevance to the MDL cases and should not be produced here.

1 For all or any one of the above reasons, PTO No. 5 should be modified such that Uber need
 2 not produce plaintiff- and case-specific documents from prior cases.³

3 **II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

4 In PTO No. 4, the Court ordered the parties to file joint or competing proposals for a PTO
 5 on discovery. ECF No. 152 at 6. On December 21, 2023, following several meet and confers on
 6 a wide variety of discovery and pretrial issues, the parties submitted competing proposals covering
 7 various topics including, among other things, the stay of discovery and coordinated discovery. *See*
 8 ECF Nos. 168 (Plaintiffs' proposal), 171 (Uber's proposal). Although Plaintiffs' submission
 9 included a request for production of documents produced in other litigations,⁴ because the parties'
 10 submissions were filed in parallel, Uber did not have the opportunity to brief its objections to that
 11 particular request. On December 28, 2023, the Court issued PTO No. 5 which, among other things,
 12 ordered Uber to produce "all documents [Uber] produced in any other Uber sexual assault cases,
 13 including arbitrations, and any other cases about the 'Safe Rides Fee.'"⁵ ECF No. 175 at 4.

14 In their submission preceding PTO No. 5, the MDL Plaintiffs appeared to acknowledge
 15 that the scope of productions related to these prior litigations likely needed to be narrowed, and
 16 affirmatively posed the idea of engaging in discussions with Uber about narrowing the scope of
 17 initial discovery "to ensure proportionality." ECF No. 168 at 4. Plaintiffs further contemplated
 18 that if Uber were to provide a "meaningful argument as to why such discovery cannot or should
 19 not take place here, . . . the Court could still order these productions in general and refer the matter
 20 to Judge Cisneros to hear any objections as to scope or burden of specific requests." *Id.*

21 ³ For these same reasons, PTO No. 5, ¶ 6.B, should be modified to limit the requirement for
 22 production of documents "pertaining to alleged individual incidents" unless the documents address
 23 the individual incidents alleged by Plaintiffs in this MDL.

24 ⁴ Plaintiffs refer to production of documents in prior cases as "off the shelf discovery," which
 25 mischaracterizes the nature of the productions they seek. There are no *pro forma* documents
 26 produced in each prior case, and documents produced in prior litigations are not neatly packaged
 27 on a shelf ready for easy production at the push of a button. Rather, collecting documents produced
 28 in prior cases requires Uber to search for produced documents (as there has been turnover among
 the Uber in-house counsel team with knowledge of those productions) and, in some instances,
 contact the numerous different outside counsel from across the country that handled the various
 prior litigations at issue and made the productions. Prior to PTO No. 5, no judge in any case
 against Uber related to sexual assault has ordered (even when requested) "off the shelf discovery."

29 ⁵ Uber did not produce any documents related to sexual assault in the "Safe Rides Fee" case,
McKnight v. Uber Technologies, Inc., Case No. 4:14-cv-05615-JST (N.D. Cal.).

1 Uber now respectfully requests the Court modify PTO No. 5 to require production of only
 2 non-case-specific and non-plaintiff-specific documents Uber produced in prior litigations. Uber
 3 is gathering other documents pursuant to PTO No. 5, including non-case-specific documents
 4 produced in prior sexual assault litigations, which will supply Plaintiffs with the “common defense
 5 discovery” they seek. *See id.* at 3. This includes policies, procedures, guidelines, and other
 6 documents relating to sexual assault that were produced in other cases.

7 **III. LEGAL STANDARDS**

8 **A. Modification of an Order**

9 “As long as a district court has jurisdiction over the case, then it possesses the inherent
 10 procedural power to reconsider, rescind, or modify an interlocutory order for cause seen by it to
 11 be sufficient.” *City of Los Angeles, Harbor Div. v. Santa Monica Baykeeper*, 254 F.3d 882, 885
 12 (9th Cir. 2001) (quoting *Melancon v. Texaco, Inc.*, 659 F.2d 551, 553 (5th Cir. 1981)) (emphasis
 13 omitted). This power “is derived from the common law, not from the Federal Rules of Civil
 14 Procedure.” *Id.* at 886.

15 **B. Limits of Discovery**

16 “[D]iscovery, like all matters of procedure, has ultimate and necessary boundaries.”
 17 *Oppenheimer Fund, Inc. v. Sanders*, 437 U.S. 340, 351 (1978) (quoting *Hickman v. Taylor*, 329
 18 U.S. 495, 507 (1947)). A principal boundary is established by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
 19 26(b)(1), which permits parties to “obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter” so long
 20 as the discovery is “*relevant* to any party’s claim or defense and *proportional* to the needs of the
 21 case.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) (emphasis added).

22 Under the plain language of Rule 26(b)(1), evidence is not discoverable simply because it
 23 is relevant; it must also be proportional to the needs of the case. Therefore, a district court must
 24 limit even relevant discovery in some instances, including when “the discovery sought is
 25 unreasonably cumulative or duplicative.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C)(i). As explained in the
 26 relevant notes from the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, “[t]he objective [of Rule 26] is to
 27 guard against redundant or *disproportionate* discovery by giving the court authority to reduce the
 28 amount of discovery that may be directed to matters that are otherwise proper subjects of inquiry.”

1 *Gonzales v. Google, Inc.*, 234 F.R.D. 674, 680 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 26
 2 advisory committee's note to 1983 amendment) (emphasis added). Over time, Rule 26(b)(1) has
 3 been amended to address "the need to impose reasonable limits on discovery through increased
 4 reliance on the common-sense concept of proportionality." *Jensen v. BMW of N. Am., LLC*, 328
 5 F.R.D. 557, 560 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 15, 2019) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

6 Courts thus require parties to "size and shape their discovery requests to the requisites of a
 7 case," and discovery should be tailored to "provide parties with 'efficient access to what is needed
 8 to prove a claim or defense, but eliminate unnecessary or wasteful discovery.'" *Id.* (quoting
 9 *Roberts v. Clark Cty. Sch. Dist.*, 312 F.R.D. 594, 603 (D. Nev. 2016)). Here, the MDL Plaintiffs
 10 cannot show that documents specific to individual victims in prior, resolved lawsuits are needed
 11 or otherwise proportionate to proving their own individual claims.

12 **IV. ARGUMENT**

13 PTO No. 5 should be modified because the case-specific and plaintiff-specific documents
 14 produced by Uber in prior litigations involving sexual assault are irrelevant, and raise serious
 15 privacy and confidentiality concerns for the plaintiffs in those prior cases. The production of the
 16 case-specific discovery is at odds with the survivor-centered approach that empowers survivors of
 17 sexual abuse to control and share stories of their unique and traumatic experiences on their own
 18 terms. Moreover, the prior cases did not proceed to trial, and the introduction of unproven
 19 allegations risks causing this litigation to devolve into mini-litigations in which Uber would have
 20 to effectively reopen discovery to defend against allegations related to these prior incidents.
 21 Production of documents produced in unrelated, irrelevant, and resolved cases not only injects
 22 other plaintiffs into cases they did not ask to be a part of, but it also risks diverting the parties' and
 23 the Court's attention away from the efficient resolution of the MDL cases.

24 **A. Plaintiff-Specific Documents From Prior Cases Are Not Relevant to the
 25 Allegations of the MDL Plaintiffs**

26 Plaintiff-specific documents and information about other, unrelated incidents of sexual
 27 assault or misconduct have no relevance to the incidents and experiences alleged by any of the
 28 MDL Plaintiffs. There is no indication that the particular factual circumstances of the incidents

1 alleged in prior cases are the same as in the MDL cases: the plaintiffs are all different, the
 2 independent drivers are all different, the time periods are different, the locations are all
 3 different, the alleged misconduct is all different (ranging from inappropriate comments to
 4 assault), the circumstances of the incidents are all different (some alleged incidents occurred
 5 during the rides at issue while others occurred hours, days, or weeks after the rides), and the
 6 alleged injuries are all different. The MDL Plaintiffs' claims focus on the intentional and
 7 potentially criminal misconduct of specific independent drivers. What happened to each MDL
 8 Plaintiff, and how each was impacted, varies from case to case, and from the prior cases. Thus the
 9 case-specific documents from prior cases regarding other alleged incidents of sexual assault and
 10 behaviors of other independent drivers do not relate to what happened to the MDL Plaintiffs.

11 That is especially true because sexual assaults are highly individualized incidents that
 12 can take many different forms and are caused by the intentional and often criminal behavior of
 13 different independent drivers, under totally different conditions and circumstances. The MDL
 14 Plaintiffs' own co-lead counsel has stated that in "individual cases," "the details and severity
 15 of the cases widely vary."⁶ Where, as here, the proximate cause of the MDL Plaintiffs' alleged
 16 injuries is the intentional misconduct of specific independent drivers, case-specific documents
 17 about different alleged injuries caused by different independent drivers, under entirely different
 18 circumstances, are immaterial and unlikely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

19 The prior cases also are likely to differ in terms of the claims and theories of liability raised
 20 by the plaintiffs, as well as the merits of such claims. These factors necessarily dictated the
 21 appropriate scope of discovery, and what was ultimately produced by Uber, in the prior litigations
 22 and should not be transposed onto this MDL to dictate the proper scope of discovery here.

23 **B. Production of Plaintiff-Specific and Case-Specific Documents From Prior
 24 Cases Presents Serious Privacy and Confidentiality Concerns for Survivors**

25 Even if Plaintiffs were requesting relevant documents - - which they are not - - the Court
 26 should still modify PTO No. 5 because production of the plaintiff-specific and case-specific

27 ⁶ *Uber faces mounting sexual assault, harassment lawsuits in San Francisco*, KRON4 (July 1,
 28 2021, 10:24 AM), <https://www.kron4.com/news/bay-area/uber-faces-mounting-sexual-assault-harassment-lawsuits-in-san-francisco>.

1 documents from prior cases regarding sexual assault would infringe on the privacy and
 2 confidentiality interests of the plaintiffs in those prior cases -- *i.e.*, individual victims and survivors
 3 of alleged sexual assault -- who are not involved in this litigation and who, quite to the contrary,
 4 chose to resolve their claims against Uber privately and confidentially.

5 The type of documents sought by the MDL Plaintiffs -- including reports and statements
 6 regarding the sexual assaults of other individuals and the impact of those assaults on those other
 7 individuals -- are by their very nature extremely sensitive and personal, often involving traumatic
 8 and life-altering consequences, such that disclosure would invade their privacy and intrude on their
 9 recovery. *See Pioneer Elecs. (USA) v. Superior Ct.* 40 Cal. 4th 360, 372 (2007) (observing that
 10 disclosure of “particularly sensitive” personal information such as one’s personal medical history
 11 or current medical condition constitutes a serious invasion of privacy). The significance of this
 12 privacy interest is demonstrated by the fact that many plaintiffs in sexual assault lawsuits,
 13 including the MDL Plaintiffs, choose to file under pseudonyms to protect their identities and avoid
 14 public scrutiny of such private matters.

15 The plaintiffs in these prior cases already decided *not* to share their stories in court.⁷ This
 16 is part of the reason why there are protective orders, confidentiality agreements, and nondisclosure
 17 agreements governing those cases, including the case-specific documents. Absent these legally
 18 binding protections, the plaintiffs might have decided against pursuing their legal claims -- or at
 19 least not in a judicial forum -- and their case-specific documents might have never been produced.

20
 21 ⁷ A survivor’s right to choose if, when, and how to speak up about her experience is
 22 widely recognized. *See, e.g.*, N.J. Dep’t of L. & Pub. Safety, Div. of Crim. Just., *Attorney*
 23 *General Standards for Providing Services to Victims of Sexual Assault* (3d ed. 2018)
 24 (setting standards for “respecting the integrity, choices, and autonomy of each victim” and
 25 “protecting the victim’s privacy and confidential information”). For example, numerous states
 26 recognize the right of a survivor to choose whether to report their assault to law enforcement.
 27 *See, e.g.*, N.Y. Dep’t of Health, *N.Y. State Sexual Assault Victim Bill of Rights*,
 28 <https://www.health.ny.gov/publications/1934.pdf>; N.J. Stat. § 52:4B-60.2(c)(3).

29 These rights are imperative to a survivor’s healing. To illustrate, in one study of sexual
 30 assault, researchers found that “[a]ll of the participants expressed feelings of discomfort with the
 31 police” and “[m]any described that making a report to the police was challenging due to shame,
 32 vulnerability, and exposure of a disclosure.” Jodie Murphy-Oikenen et al., *Unfounded Sexual*
 33 *Assault: Women’s Experiences of Not Being Believed by the Police*, *J. Interpersonal Violence*
 34 (2020), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9136376/>.

When those plaintiffs brought their own cases and entered into corresponding protective orders and agreements, they could not have anticipated the instant coordinated proceeding, the first of its kind for sexual assault-related claims against Uber. While the resurfacing of a plaintiff's case in any forum could be anxiety-inducing, the scale of this consolidated litigation amplifies this risk. There are approximately 30 Plaintiffs' firms involved in this MDL to date, and the large number of people involved could increase anxiety for a plaintiff about the number of people with access to documents relevant to her personal experience, as well as a perceived risk of disclosure.⁸ This consolidated case is also undeniably higher profile than a single sexual assault case. The Plaintiffs who joined this MDL were able to weigh these considerations before deciding whether and how to proceed with their claims. The plaintiffs in prior litigations were not able to consider these factors and have not been empowered to make these decisions for themselves.

Even if it were possible to redact all identifying information in the case-specific documents -- which would be difficult and does not guarantee non-disclosure -- it would not change the fact that survivors should have agency over their stories, which they did not necessarily want told in court or, worse, *retold* in court by others. Assuming that plaintiffs' identities can be shielded with absolute certainty is a mistake when individual identities and information are so readily accessible online and from other public sources. And more importantly, it should be up to those individuals, not the parties, to decide what (if any) protections sufficiently guarantee their privacy and security.

Recognizing these concerns, sexual violence advocacy organizations strongly recommend a "survivor-centered" approach to incidents of sexual assault and misconduct and encourage justice systems to incorporate this approach. *See, e.g.*, Nat'l Sexual Violence Res. Ctr. et al., *Promoting Collaboration Between Victim Advocates and Sex Offender Management Professionals: A Resource Package*, at 4 (2016) <https://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/ovw-collaboration-v-2.pdf> (advocating for practices that are "responsive to victims' rights, needs, and interests and do not further traumatize or otherwise negatively impact survivors"); *id.* at 43 (noting

⁸ For this reason, the operative Protective Order in this MDL does not cure the privacy concerns at issue. The privacy rights of a non-party who elected to remain anonymous in a prior case or otherwise desired to keep her personal information and story private are not protected when documents specific to her prior case are disseminated to hundreds of individuals (including Plaintiffs, lawyers and legal staff, and Court staff) in a lawsuit that has nothing to do with them.

1 the importance of “ensur[ing] victim input in critical decision-making at all phases of the
 2 management process”). Production of plaintiff-specific and case-specific documents from prior
 3 sexual assault cases is contrary to survivor-centric principles. All of the other cases at issue involve
 4 plaintiffs who are not part of this MDL, and it should not be up to the parties here to decide whether
 5 and how to share exquisitely personal details about a non-party’s unique and traumatic experience
 6 of sexual assault, especially when there is no compelling need for any unwelcome disclosures.

7 Finally, a survivor’s expectation of privacy and confidentiality is of chief importance.
 8 Without assurances, survivors may opt not to report instances of sexual assault for fear that taking
 9 action could lead to unwanted disclosure of their stories, even years after they thought their cases
 10 had been resolved. Sexual assaults are vastly underreported as is. *See, e.g., Paramasamy v.*
 11 *Ashcroft*, 295 F.3d 1047, 1053 & n.3 (9th Cir. 2002) (noting that sexual assault is underreported
 12 and collecting sources); Cameron Kimble & Inimai M. Chettiar, *Sexual Assault Remains*
 13 *Dramatically Underreported*, Brennan Ctr. for Just. (Oct. 4, 2018), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/sexual-assault-remains-dramatically-underreported> (identifying
 14 fear of retaliation from society, “revictimization, distortion of allegations, and generally not being
 15 believed” as reasons why sexual assault is underreported). Any remote or conceivable benefit of
 16 producing these case-specific documents is far outweighed by the potential that doing so could
 17 chill a survivor’s willingness to report what is already an underreported crime.
 18

19 C. Plaintiff-Specific and Case-Specific Documents Are Not Needed

20 Plaintiffs may contend that plaintiff-specific and case-specific documents from prior cases
 21 are relevant to show *notice* to Uber of allegations of sexual assault. Uber disagrees that a prior
 22 sexual assault committed by a different independent driver under different circumstances in a
 23 different state and at a different point in time is sufficient to give Uber notice that any of the
 24 independent drivers involved in the MDL Plaintiffs’ cases would engage in sexual assault or
 25 misconduct. But in any event, the MDL Plaintiffs do not need case-specific discovery from other
 26 cases because they have numerous other avenues of discovery for exploring the alleged notice
 27 issue. For one, the complaints in the prior lawsuits are publicly filed, and there are other documents
 28 Uber has made publicly available. Then, there are the other documents Uber will produce in the

1 ordinary course of discovery in the MDL, plus interrogatories, requests for admission, stipulations,
 2 and depositions. Third, data and statistics produced in Uber's U.S. Safety Reports include figures
 3 involving sexual assault and other incidents occurring in connection with Uber's platform. There
 4 has been no showing made that all these sources will not suffice to make whatever arguments
 5 MDL Plaintiffs wish to make about notice.

6 **D. Production of Plaintiff-Specific and Case-Specific Documents Could
 7 Seriously Prejudice Uber and Unnecessarily Delay Resolution of the MDL
 Plaintiffs' Cases**

8 Production of case-specific documents from prior litigations -- the vast majority of which
 9 have been resolved either by dismissal or settlement -- invites unwarranted and unnecessary
 10 scrutiny into closed matters that could significantly prejudice Uber. Because none of these prior
 11 litigations were resolved through a trial or hearing, the merits of contested allegations were never
 12 tested, much less conclusively or legally determined. To the extent the MDL Plaintiffs seek to use
 13 plaintiff-specific and case-specific discovery produced in prior cases, Uber will be unable to
 14 defend itself without effectively reopening and taking discovery in the previously-resolved cases.
 15 In this way, introduction of these documents in the MDL creates an unnecessary risk that this
 16 litigation will devolve into mini-litigations concerning other alleged incidents or investigations
 17 into what Uber, the independent drivers, or the plaintiffs from those prior cases did or did not do
 18 in relation to other alleged offenses -- all of which is unrelated to the cases in the MDL.

19 It does not serve the purpose of the MDL to relitigate previously-resolved cases. It is also
 20 not feasible -- or an efficient use of the justice system -- for the parties in this case to build the
 21 necessary record to make documents produced in other cases remotely informative. Rather, the
 22 parties should focus attention on the Plaintiffs, independent drivers, and alleged incidents involved
 23 in the MDL cases. Any focus on previously-resolved litigations would unnecessarily delay
 24 discovery into the incidents at issue and is not justifiable considering that the documents at issue
 25 are not relevant. In the interests of judicial efficiency and resolution of the MDL cases, the parties
 26 should not litigate or relitigate cases that have already been resolved and are not before this Court.

27 **V. CONCLUSION**

28 For the forgoing reasons, Uber respectfully requests that this Court grant the Motion.

1 DATED: February 6, 2023

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP

3 By: /s/ Randall S. Luskey
4 RANDALL S. LUSKEY
5 ROBERT ATKINS

6 *Attorney for Defendants*
7 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC,
8 and RASIER-CA, LLC

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28